

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 7, 9-13, 15-16, 19-20, 22-52, 54-61 are pending in the application. Claims 1-2, 7, 9-13, 15-16, 19-20, 22-23, 35-36, 41, 43, 54, 56-58, and 60-61 have been rejected. Claim 59 has been allowed. Claim 42 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 24-34 and 44-52 stand withdrawn. By this amendment, claims 1, 12-13, 35-43, 54, and 56-57 have been cancelled, and claims 2, 7, 9, 15-16, 22-23, and 58-61 have been amended. Claims presently active are claims Claims 2, 7, 9-11, 15-16, 19-20, 22-34, 44-52 and 58-61. Favorable reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claim 59 is allowed. (It should be noted that the Office Action Summary page failed to reflect this fact, which was noted by the Examiner on page 9 of the Office Action.) By this amendment, claims 1, 12-13, 35-43, 54 and 56-57 have been deleted. The remaining dependent claims have been amended such that claims 2, 7, 9, 15-16, 22, 23 and 58 now depend from allowed claim 59. Where necessary, the language of these claims has been amended to be consistent with the terminology of claim 59. Claim 59 has been amended to correct a minor typographical error. Claim 60 has been amended to incorporate the novel features from claim 59. Claim 61 depends from claim 60 and has been amended to be consistent with the amended language of claim 60.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1, 7, 9-13, 15-16, 19-20, 22-23, 35-36, 41-43, 53-54 and 56-58 and 60-61 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Woods et al. reference in view of Dhond et al..

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Woods et al. "Image Distortion in Stereoscopic Video System" in view of Dhond et al. "Stereo Matching in the Presence of Narrow Occluding objects Using Dynamic Disparity Search", and further in view of Zhang U.S. Publication 2003/0197779.

Claim 1 has been amended, and the remaining dependent claims that previously depended from claim 1 have been amended to depend from claim 59, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable. It is therefore believed that claims 2, 7, 9-11, 15-16, 19-20, 22-23 and 58-59 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 60 has been amended to include the feature that two different stereoscopic images are displayed to two different users. This feature is analogous to corresponding elements in claim 59. It is believed that claim 60 should therefore be allowable for the same reasons that the same reasons that claim 59 is allowable. Claim 61 depends from claim 60 and should be allowed along with it.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claim 59 represents allowable subject matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendment, it is respectfully submitted that the claims in their present form are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider that additional amendments are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the favor is requested of a telephone call to the undersigned agent for the purpose of discussing such amendments.

Respectfully submitted,



Agent for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 64,579

Kevin E. Spaulding/l
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-588-3706
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.